REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-5. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-5 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Seecamp (U.S. patent 3,722,358) in view of Tuma (U.S. patent 5,216,195). The Examiner contends that it would be obvious to combine a slide having a cam interacting with a transfer bar, as suggested by Tuma, with the double action transfer bar improvement taught by Seecamp.

The applicant has disclosed an improved hammer trigger mechanism for a firearm which enables both single action and double action operation through a simple and unique linkage system employing a single transfer bar 26 operated by the trigger. The transfer bar is manipulated to release the hammer by a first finger on the transfer bar moving against a cam surface on the slide as the transfer bar is pulled in a forward direction against the cam surface. A notch in the transfer bar cooperates with a double-action let off pin on the hammer to cock and release the hammer. A second finger on the transfer bar cooperates with a single-action let-off pin on the sear. When the hammer is cocked for single action firing, the second finger pivots the sear to release the hammer. When the sear is not holding the hammer cocked, the transfer bar notch (engaging the double-action let-off pin on the hammer) pivots the hammer until it is released by the downward movement of the transfer bar.

A preliminary amendment to claim 1 was filed on December 13, 2006 to more clearly define a known firearm structure in the preamble of the claim and the improvement in the characterizing part of the claim.

Seecamp describes a single action and double action firearm accomplished by converting a single action mechanism firearm. The single action mechanism (trigger bar 14, sear 44 and disconnector 48) is completely separate from the double action mechanism improvement (cocking link 20

and cocking lug 16 on hammer 10). (See col. 3, lines 29-42 and col. 4, lines 30-60). Seecamp discloses the elements recited in the preamble of applicant's claim 1, as amended in the preliminary amendment filed December 13, 2006, with the exception of a cam surface in the slide. Seebach does not appear to disclose the elements alleged by the Examiner.

1. Seecamp does not appear to show a single action let-off pin disposed on sear 44. His sear is pivoted by trigger bar 14 via disconnector 48 pushing the sear itself.

2. Seecamp's cocking link 20 (transfer bar) does not appear to have a second finger engaging a single action let-off pin to pivot the sear. The cocking link 20 is only used for double action let-off and is completely divorced from the single-action let-off effected by trigger bar 14.

3. Seecamp does not appear to have a first finger cooperating with a slide cam surface to release the hammer. Seecamp's double-action release is effected through hammer rotation and the cam shape of cocking lug 16, and not by a transfer bar movement caused by the cam surface on the slide.

While applicant agrees that Seecamp possesses a double action let-off pin on the hammer, the release of the hammer in applicant's firearm is through an entirely different mechanism, i.e., by the cooperation between a finger on the transfer bar and a cam surface on the slide. As to the alleged showing by Seecamp of the improvement recited in the claim 1 "characterizing clause", the recited elements are simply and totally lacking in Seecamp.

Tuma describes a slide with a cam for interaction with a transfer bar when the slide moves. Tuma only relates to a double-action trigger mechanism (col. 2, line 55) and is for a safe firearm which holds the hammer away from the firing pin when in a decocked position.

First, it should be noted that the trigger rotation moves the trigger bar 4 (transfer bar) away from the cammed surface 22 when the trigger is pulled.

The cammed surface 22 has no effect on the transfer bar until the slide moves when the gun fires, moving the slide and cammed surface past the finger 21. The cammed surface 22 does not cause the release of the hammer as the trigger is pulled. It allows the sear to reset into the decocking position.

This being the case, Tums does not teach one skilled in the art how to modify Seecamp, since the improvement shown by Seecamp depends upon the cooperation of the transfer bar with the slide can to effect release of the hammer in a single-action let-off, and Tuma does not use the cammed surface 22 for this purpose. As to motivation, Seecamp is seeking a combined single-action and double-action hammer trigger mechanism, rather than a safer handgun, so there is no motivation to combine the teachings, even if combining them were feasible. Since Tuma does not teach the lacking element, there is no motivation to combine his teachings to modify Seebach.

The advantage of applicant's invention is to use a single transfer bar 26 for both single action and double action hammer release, thereby simplifying the hammer trigger mechanism. Seebach requires two "transfer bars" and Tuma only teaches a double action mechanism.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested and it is asked that the case be passed to issue.

Applicants believe no fees are due with the filing of this response; however, if it is determined that a fee is required, please charge our Deposit Account No. 13-0235, maintained by Applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
William C. Crutcher
Registration No. 19,279
Attorney for Applicant(s)

McCormick, Paulding & Huber LLP
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402
Phone: (860) 549-5290